



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

circumstances, to Hamlet's famous 'To be or not to be,' except that they both concern death. As the editor himself says, the tone of Homberg's monologue is one of weary resignation, and the thought is, that life here is short and uncertain, while the future life cannot be so bad after all. Hamlet's soliloquy is one of doubt and horror at the uncertainty of the state after death which makes man willing to 'grunt and sweat under a weary life.' He shrinks with horror from death, while Homberg is resigned to the thought of it, and can even jest grimly about it (lines 1294 & 95). In the details there are no analogies either, and nothing supports the author's positive statement that 'this monologue was doubtless suggested by Hamlet's.'

Other quotations cited in the Notes are open to the same criticism. When analyzed, they are either misleading or else irrelevant. Enough has been said, however, to indicate that the editor really made a serious mistake when he suffered himself to be led by the example of certain German commentators (an example which has unfortunately been followed by others in this country), into finding echoes and influences where a common-sense, careful examination shows that there is a surface similarity and nothing else below it. It is the more to be deplored as the book is generally so well and sensibly edited.

An exhaustive bibliography with brief comments on the value of the books and articles cited concludes the volume.

GUSTAV GRUENER.

Yale University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea*, with Introduction and Notes by JAMES TAFT HATFIELD. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899. 12mo. liv+187 pp.

EIGHT or nine years ago, when the Hewett edition of Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* appeared, it certainly seemed that the last word had been spoken for this text for some time to come. The work contained an introduction that was minute and careful; the text had been thoroughly revised; and, finally, the notes left little to be desired in point of fulness of grammatical detail and literary suggestion.

Prof. Hewett recognized clearly that the "use of any literary work will vary with the purpose of the instructor and the demands of his classes." He accordingly gave a great abundance of critical material, and suggested that each instructor seek out that which was most useful to him. Thus the burden of selecting the proper material was placed where it naturally belongs—upon the user; as a result, the text has proved universally useful.

In this regard, the new edition of *Hermann und Dorothea* by Prof. Hatfield is quite a different type of book. In its own way, it is as complete and perfect as the Hewett edition; but it differs from it in that it is prepared with a definite pedagogic purpose: namely, to cultivate the literary taste of the student rather than to widen his grammatical and philological knowledge. This we are told in the preface to the book; hence we are fully prepared to find a dearth of grammatical facts, supplemented by a free use of every legitimate means of exciting the student's literary appreciation.

Prof. Hatfield has been perfectly consistent in every detail of his work. In the introduction of fifty-four pages, he has furnished all the material necessary for the student as a basis for the study of the poem, as well as its relation to the poet's life. The general impression is pleasing; it is smooth and attractive, conveying the impression that the editor proposes to present the matter in an agreeable, rather than a convincing manner. Nevertheless the facts presented are abundant and accurate. Only in one particular does the material seem incomplete, and that is, in the description of great historical events which served as a background for the poem. But this possible defect is more than offset by the excellence of the sections on the *Sources of the Poem* and its *Metrical Form*. At the time when *Hermann und Dorothea* was written, Goethe was at the very climax of his enthusiasm for the literature of Greece and Rome. Consequently, whoever would interpret any work of this period, must of necessity be thoroughly conversant with the language and literature of the classics. This certainly can be said of Prof. Hatfield; and herein lies the great charm and value of his edition of *Hermann und Dorothea*.

As for the text, little need be said. The

editor has had at his disposal Prof. Hewett's exhaustive critical work,—a fact that places beyond the possibility of dispute the statement that

"the present (text) is more free from outside intrusions than any which has appeared since Goethe undertook the revision of the poem."

But it is in the Notes that our interest naturally centres; for here it is that the editor has taken issue with some of the older schools of editors, and has founded his work on the principle of developing the literary appreciation rather than fostering the love for grammatical soundness. *Hermann und Dorothea* is to be studied as a masterpiece of literature rather than a source of philological inspiration. The editor tells us in his Preface that

"the days are past when the master-work of a great poet could be used chiefly as a *corpus vile* for the demonstration of facts in Indo-European phonetics, and yet the feeling cannot be avoided that we are often not satisfied with the direct message of the artist's creation itself, but must attach a load of outside information If our poem is worthy of the place it has held for a century, it is because it is not a dead work but a living one, and the most helpful interpretation of any such work must always be sought in the living word of one who has reverently penetrated into its spirit, and who transmits it faithfully to the next generation. Some aid must be given to help the transition from the known to the unknown, in the case of the student of a foreign language and civilization, so that the author shall not speak as an alien, but as a friend; some illustrations and parallels which shall aid in the comprehension of the rich content of the words and phrases of a strange idiom; some assistance must be lent in making clear the purpose of the artist, but *whatever is more than these, in the way of insinuated matter, cometh of evil.*"

This will suffice. It is easy to see that Prof. Hatfield is wholly in sympathy with the school of literary editors; he proposes to do for *Hermann und Dorothea* what Prof. Paul Shorey has done for the Odes and Epodes of Horace. A careful examination of the Notes proves that Prof. Hatfield has worked consistently and faithfully. By means of carefully prepared synopses and summaries, and through the agency of a great abundance of "parallel passages" and "cross references," he has sought to draw the student away from the narrow consideration of the grammatical facts, to the enjoyment of the wisest and best in the world's

literature. Now all this is most commendable; but the question still confronts us: To what degree can we hope to get the student to make use of the richness of literary reference? If we can succeed in so doing, the matter is valuable; if not, it must be looked upon as superfluous, fully as much so as a surplusage of grammatical discussion would be. Prof. Shorey has anticipated this possible criticism in the preface of the *Odes and Epodes*, where he states that "they (the parallel passages and cross-references) will not harm him (the young student) more than the critical and grammatical discussions found in all the school editions which *he always skips.*"

In other words, the "parallel passages" and the "cross-references" are recognized as factors of doubtful pedagogic value, neither more nor less harmful than the excess of grammatical details. It is probably true that many good instructors look upon them as impracticable for other than graduate work.

But to return to Prof. Hatfield's own notes, we find that the amount of such doubtful matter is by no means excessive. Most of the quotations are printed in full, which is certainly advisable, since they are thus rendered far more accessible to the younger student. The quotations from the classics are particularly apt and useful, in that they naturally draw the attention to the Greek and Latin originals which Goethe was intentionally imitating. From the side of the German literature, the references are commonly from Schiller or from Goethe's own works; in English we are offered a wide range extending from Shakespeare to F. Marion Crawford. The grammatical references are ample and well chosen, while the brief summaries at the close of several cantos furnish a most useful review of the work that has preceded.

In conformity with the other texts in this series, this edition of *Hermann und Dorothea* is supplied with a brief but sufficiently comprehensive Bibliography and an Index.

Speaking in general, it may be said that the edition is admirably adapted to class-room use. The typographical work is neat and uncommonly free from error. A few rhetorical peculiarities have crept into the Introduction, which after all are more matters of taste than errors. For example, the frequent use of the

inverted predicate becomes unpleasantly noticeable; thus, on page xiii: "Dramatic, no less, is the relation" and "Personal to Goethe is its breadth" etc., etc.

GEORGE T. FILES.

Bowdoin College.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Concerning Prof. Lewis's review of my recent book *Scènes de la révolution française* I desire to say that corrections and suggestions are always welcome. I am alone responsible for the way in which the proofs were read and what was overlooked in the first edition will be corrected when an opportunity occurs. I appreciate the care with which the book was read.

Noting the criticisms in detail, I may say that it was impossible to indicate the omissions in the text because they were too numerous. To have done so would have disfigured the book.

The first chapter is the introductory chapter and Lamartine is in no way responsible for anything it contains. The condensation spoken of was, however, made by a Frenchman and if the work was not well done my mistake was in putting my confidence in an unworthy person. *le lendemain 13* (4: 12) may not be elegant but I am assured that it is correct. Madame de Sévigny, speaking of the death of Turenne, says: *Il devait communier le lendemain dimanche*, which seems to be an analagous construction. *et porta toutes ses armes en triomphe* should read *et emporta toutes ces armes en triomphe*. The mistake is due to an error in transcription. The expression criticised in 5: 11 is certainly not good. It ought to read, *Les citoyens s'y rendaient*, or something of the kind. *armés* is correct in sense but wrong grammatically. Mignet says (5: 14) *moment de guerre*, which does not seem to me to be much better than *jour de guerre*. *temps de guerre* would, I imagine, have been better than either. The sentence 8: 24 (*toute cette nuit*, etc.) is taken literally from Mignet. *L'importe sur* should be *l'emporte sur* (120: 6) and also in the corresponding note.

I do not know whether my interpretation of

26: 12, 14 is better than Prof. Lewis', or not. Both are, doubtless, in accordance with the facts. The hostile demonstrations became more manifest as the king approached Paris, and the crowd also pressed more closely around him in order to show its hostility. I should be glad to see this passage further discussed.

In reply to the criticism that the notes translate too many simple words and phrases, I may say that for some pupils this is true, for others not. While it may be possible to get from most dictionaries the sense of such expressions as *faire part de*, *c'en est fait de moi*, *à l'étranger*, and others, it is, nevertheless, a matter of experience that even good students, especially those who had not read much, sometimes fail to get the meaning of them. Since my object was to make a book suitable for elementary classes, my sins of commission have, perhaps, not been very numerous in this respect.

O. B. SUPER.

Dickinson College.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Prof. Super, in the above letter, explains the infelicities of style which were noted in the first chapter of his *Scènes de la révolution française*. Those who are acquainted with his work feel convinced that these inaccuracies would not have occurred, had he been less modest and prepared, himself, this part of his text.

The expression *toute cette nuit* is not positively wrong, and, of course, would not have been mentioned had not other mistakes existed. *toute la nuit* is somewhat better, from the fact that the expression *cette nuit* tends—it may only tend, but it does tend—to have a specialized meaning.

Prof. Super writes, and is correct in so doing, that it is

"a matter of experience that even good students, especially those who have not read much, sometimes fail to get the meaning of" common expressions. It is, however, doubtful whether this be a satisfactory reason for introducing the explanation of such phrases into the notes. The question is whether such annotation renders the pupil any more successful in understanding whatever idiomatic expressions